

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01683 050026 Z

64

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-12 ADP-00 ACDA-19 AEC-11 AF-10 ARA-11

CIAE-00 DODE-00 EA-11 PM-09 H-02 INR-10 L-03 NASA-04

NEA-10 NSAE-00 NSC-10 OIC-04 PA-03 PRS-01 RSC-01

GAC-01 SCI-06 SS-15 MBFR-03 USIA-12 SAJ-01 INRE-00

TRSE-00 OMB-01 RSR-01 /197 W
----- 109961

P R 042005 Z APR 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9627

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 2844

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USLOSACLANT

USNMR SHAPE

USMISSION GENEVA

USDEL SALT TWO

AMEMBASSY BUCHAREST

AMEMBASSY BUDAPEST

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

AMEMBASSY PRAGUE

AMEMBASSY SOFIA

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

AMEMBASSY WARSAW

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 1683

HELSINKI FOR USDEL MPT

VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR

DISTO

E. O. 11652: GDS 12/31/79

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01683 050026 Z

TAGS: PARM, NATO, HU

SUBJ: MBFR: NAC DISCUSSION OF HUNGARIAN ISSUE, APRIL 4

BEGIN SUMMARY: DURING APRIL 4 NAC, PERMREPS AGREED THAT THERE WAS NO NEED AT THIS TIME TO SEND ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE TO THE AD HOC GROUP (AHG); THAT A DECISION TO MOVE FROM PROBES ON PARTICIPATION TO PROBES ON AGENDA HAD TO BE MADE BY THE NAC; THAT THE ISSUES OF PARTICIPATION AND AGENDA WERE LINKED AND COULD ONLY BE SOLVED TOGETHER; THAT THE PARTICIPATION ISSUE SHOULD BE SOLVED TOGETHER; THAT THE PARTICIPATION ISSUE SHOULD BE SOLVED FIRST; AND, THAT THE QUESTION OF AN EASTER RECESS WAS TACTICAL AND SHOULD BE WORKED OUT IN THE AHG, NOT IN THE NAC. END SUMMARY.

1. ACTING SYG PANSA REFERRED TO LATEST WEEKLY REPORT OF AD HOC GROUP (AHG) (VIENNA 2663 NOTAL), LATEST EAST- WEST MEETING, AND FACT THAT AHG WAS MEETING AFTERNOON APRIL 4. HE SAW NO NEED FOR FRESH NAC INSTRUCTIONS (SIC) TO THE AHG.

2. MENZIES (CANADA) CONCURRED AND OFFERED HIS IMPRESSION THAT AHG WOULD SEND REPORT TO NAC ON RESULTS OF PROBES AND REQUEST NAC COMMENTS IF REQUIRED. HE SUGGESTED NAC COULD ASK AHG FOR TIMING OF REPORT AND FOR INCLUSION OF AN ANALYSIS OF THE POSITIONS OF THE OTHER SIDE AND OF OPTIONS FOR THE NAC TO CONSIDER. PANSA CONCURRED IN REQUESTING THE ANALYSIS AND OPTIONS.

3. DE STAERCKE (BELGIUM) REFERRED TO REFERENCE TO UNILATERAL STATEMENTS IN AHG REPORT AND EXPRESSED DESIRE THAT NAC RECEIVE TEXTS MENTIONED. HE REFERRED TO APPARENT DIVISION IN AHG BETWEEN THOSE WHO WISHED TO DISCUSS THE AGENDA WITH THE OTHER SIDE AND POSITIONS OF BELGIUM AND ITALY AND SUGGESTED THAT NAC DISCUSS THIS ISSUE. CATALANO (ITALY) CONCURRED.

4. SPIERENBURG (NETHERLANDS) DID NOT BELIEVE ALLIES SHOULD BEGIN DISCUSSIONS LEADING TO NON- AGREEMENT ON AN AGENDA; I. E. THE " TWO BASKET" APPROACHED HE MENTIONED AT MARCH 28 NAC. HE HAD NO MAJOR OBJECTION, HOWEVER, TO A DISCUSSION OF AN AGENDA WITH THE OTHER SIDE SO LONG AS THE PARTICIPATION PROBLEM WAS SOLVED BEFORE NEGOTIATIONS BEGIN. CATALANO STATED THAT IF AHG WERE TO DISCUSS AGENDA WITH THE OTHER

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01683 050026 Z

SIDE AT THIS TIME, THAT DECISION WOULD HAVE TO BE TAKEN BY NAC. SPIERENBURG CONCURRED.

5. PECK (UK) BELIEVED THAT UNILATERAL DECLARATIONS WERE A MATTER OF TACTICS AND WITHIN THE GUIDELINES GIVEN BY THE NAC TO THE AHG. HE DID NOT BELIEVE THAT AN AGENDA SHOULD BE CONCLUDED UNTIL THE HUNGARIAN PROBLEM WAS SOLVED. ON THE ISSUE OF A RECESS, HE DID NOT FEEL THE SOVIETS WOULD PERMIT ANY PROGRESS IN VIENNA UNTIL THEY SEE PROGRESS IN

HELSINKI. THE SOVIETS, HE SAID, MAKE A LINKAGE EVEN IF WE RIGHTEOUSLY AVOID IT. HE THEREFORE THOUGHT AN EASTER RECESS WAS A GOOD IDEA.

6. DE STAERCKE REMINDED MEETING THAT NAC HAD ALWAYS SAID THAT THE PROBLEM OF PARTICIPATION WAS SUPERIOR TO AN AGENDA AND WOULD HAVE TO BE HANDLED FIRST. HE SUGGESTED WE MIGHT TELL THE SOVIETS THAT WE WOULD BE UNWILLING TO AGREE ON AN AGENDA UNTIL THE PARTICIPATION PROBLEM WERE SOLVED. HE REFERRED TO THE TWO ISSUES AS SIAMESE TWINS-- ONE COULD NOT EXIST WITHOUT THE OTHER. HE CONTESTED PECK' S CATEGORIZATION OF UNILATERAL STATEMENTS AS A TACTICAL MATTER, NOTING THAT STATEMENTS CONCERNED PARTICIPATION.

7. PANSA ASKED IF CURRENT DISCUSSION WAS LEADING TO A NAC DECISION TO AUTHORIZE AHG TO PROBE ON AGENDA. CATALANO REPLIED NEGATIVELY AND STATED HE WOULD HAVE TO SEEK INSTRUCTIONS.

8. RUMSFELD DREW UPON GUIDANCE IN STATE 061793 REGARDING ISSUES OF AGENDA AND RECESS.

9. PANSA IN PARTIAL SUMMING UP BELIEVED EVERYONE AGREED THAT A NAC DECISION WAS NECESSARY TO MOVE FROM A DISCUSSION OF PARTICIPATION TO PROBING ON THE AGENDA; THAT THE CONSENSUS WAS TO TRY TO SOLVE THE PARTICIPATION ISSUE BEFORE GOING TO THE AGENDA BUT THAT TODAY' S DISCUSSION REVEALED NEW FLEXIBILITY IN THAT SOME PERMREPS COULD CONSIDER PARALLEL PROBING ON THE AGENDA WITH A FULL REALIZATION THAT THE TWO ISSUES WERE LINKED AND COULD ONLY BE SOLVED TOGETHER.

10. SPIERENBURG, IN CLARIFICATION OF HIS EARLIER STATEMENT, SAID THAT WHILE HE HAD NO MAJOR OBJECTION TO EXPLORING THE AGENDA, PRIORITY SHOULD BE GIVEN TO SOLVING THE
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 01683 050026 Z

HUNGARIAN PROBLEM.

11. AFTER DE STAERCKE AGAIN ASKED THAT NAC CONSIDER TEXT OF UNILATERAL STATEMENTS, MENZIES SAID IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT FOR NAC TO DISCUSS THEM IN A VACUUM. CATALANO CONCURRED. PECK SAID HE DID NOT BELIEVE NAC SHOULD BE CONCERNED WITH DETAILS SUCH AS TACTICAL TEXTS.

12. PANSA, SUMMING UP, SAID: NO INSTRUCTIONS NEED BE SENT TO THE AHG FOR THE TIME BEING; HE WOULD ASK AHG IF AND WHEN IT WAS PREPARED TO SUBMIT REPORT REFERRED TO BY MENZIES, AND FOR TEXTS OF UNILATERAL STATEMENTS; AND, THAT THE QUESTION OF AN EASTER RECESS WAS TACTICAL AND SHOULD BE WORKED OUT BY AD HOC GROUP. RUMSFELD

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 15 APR 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 04 APR 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: cunninfx
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973USNATO01683
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: USNATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730461/dcacjaan.tel
Line Count: 163
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: cunninfx
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 03 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <03-Aug-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <13-Sep-2001 by cunninfx>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> gwr 19990503
Subject: MBFR: NAC DISCUSSION OF HUNGARIAN ISSUE, APRIL 4
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH
USLOSACLANT
USNMR SHAPE
GENEVA

SALT TWO
BUCHAREST
BUDAPEST
HELSINKI
MOSCOW
PRAGUE
SOFIA
VIENNA
WARSAW

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005